



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,428	11/07/2003	Takuichi Arai	07057.0056	9393
22852	7590	07/06/2005		
			EXAMINER	
		FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413	ZIMMER, MARC S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/702,428	ARAI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marc S. Zimmer	1712

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc S. Zimmer. (3) _____.
 (2) Deborah Herzfeld. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4,9,14,19 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marc Zimmer
 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Art Unit: 1712

Ms Herzfeld:

Per our interview today, June 28, 2005, these are the issues that I believe need to be addressed before the case is allowed. They are:

(i) In claims 9 and 19, to say that a monomer having the vinyl radical "contains" styrene implies that a styrene residue makes up a fraction of a larger molecule. This is inconsistent with the language of the Specification (see paragraph 29) and, frankly raises doubts as to what Applicant is trying to claim. It is, therefore, once again submitted that "contains" should be replaced with "is". If Applicant seeks coverage of a wider array of vinyl materials than they might consider inserting Markush language that refers to the individual monomers set out in paragraph 29. (It should be appreciated that "allyl and acryl" are not descriptions of compounds but rather are residues of a larger compound and, hence, should not be members of said Markush group. Furthermore, 3-fluorinated ethylene and 4-fluorinated ethylene should be re-identified as trifluoroethylene and tetrafluoroethylene.

(ii) The method of claim 14 is not supported by the original Specification and needs to be rewritten. Applicant is referred to paragraphs 28 and 33 and the description under test sample 2 where it is made clear that, in fact, the polymer (molecular structure) is derived from all three of these monomers wherein they are all copolymerized at once, not in sequence as the claim suggests. It is only after said copolymerization that the polymer is modified by reaction with a strong acid. The Examiner therefore recommends that claim 14 be amended to claim a method entailing introducing a strong

Art Unit: 1712

acid functional group into a polymer derived from the vinyl radical and the two monomers expressed by way of structural formulae (It is believed that this mistake was the result of Applicant trying to normalize the language of claims 4 and 14 but this is not feasible given that the divinyldiorganylsilane is not reacted only after the vinyl monomer and vinyltriorganylsilane are reacted.)

(iii) Speaking of claim 4, the phrase "the formula being" should be moved directly above the formula itself.

(iv) In claim 20, it should be made clear which monomer is being further limited since there are three monomers recited in claim 14 by inserting the phrase "expressed by a formula" after the word "monomer" followed by the formula for the organosilicon compound bearing a vinyl group and R⁴, R⁵, and R⁶ groups. Also in claim 20, there is no such thing as vinyl tris silane and it is suspected that this was intended to be "vinyl tris(trimethylsiloxy) silane". See claim 10.

An updated search has been completed and the Examiner did not discover any new art more germane than that already of record so if Applicant were to make these changes, the case may be allowed.

Please call to confirm receipt of this correspondence. Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marc J. Sander".